



City of Annapolis

Department of Planning & Zoning
145 Gorman Street, 3rd Floor
Annapolis, MD 21401-2535

PlanZone@annapolis.gov • 410-260-2200 • Fax 410-263-9158 • TDD use MD Relay or 711 • www.annapolis.gov

Historic Preservation Commission VIRTUAL PUBLIC HEARING June 8, 2021

The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) of the City of Annapolis held its regularly scheduled public hearing as a virtual meeting on June 8, 2021. **Chair** Leahy called the meeting to order at 7:09pm.

Commissioners Present: **Chair** Leahy, **Vice Chair** Collins, Dr. Scott, Williams, Finch

Staff Present: R. Laynor- Chief, Historic Preservation, J. Tower, Assistant Chief, Historic Preservation, Dr. Sally Nash, Jacquelyn Rouse, Joel Braithwaite-Assistant City Attorney

Others Present: Sheryl Wood-Counsel to the Board

Chair Leahy introduced the commissioners and staff. He stated the Commission's purpose pursuant to the authority of the land use articles but because there were no public hearing items, he waived administering the oath en masse to all persons intending to testify at the hearing.

C. ANNOUNCEMENTS

Ms. Laynor announced that the Maryland Association of Historic District Commissions have issued a grant that requires training. She explained that HPC has taken two courses and they are asking the HPC to take a course again this year. She noted that the two courses are "Connecting with the Community" and "Sustainability." She added that the HPC has to decide on the course by June 30, 2021.

Mr. Tower noted that there has been discussion about a Bill that would require placing all new gas meters on the exterior of buildings for all new services. He is currently reviewing an application for new service for this type of placement. He has concerns regarding this requested change.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. April 13, 2021 Meeting Minutes

Vice Chair Collins moved approval of the April 13, 2021 meeting minutes as amended. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

E. NEW VIOLATIONS AND STATUS OF ACTIVE VIOLATIONS

Mr. Tower explained that the Department is working actively to address all violations. He added that there are requests for new sidewalk café furniture so there are a number of violation on the placement of furniture without approval. He noted that the Department has been successful in getting approvals but there are still some without approvals. He has had success working with the new owners who do not understand the guidelines.

F. CONSENT DOCKET

- 1. 132 Market Street** – Timothy Doyle – Construct a screened porch addition, covered deck addition, and a new roof over the existing areaway. (HPC2021-078) – **Approved as conditioned in the staff memorandum dated June 1, 2021.**

Vice Chair Collins moved to approve the 132 Market Street as conditioned on the Consent Docket. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

I. PRE APPLICATION

Chair Leahy reminded those present that this pre application discussion is an informal discussion held as a courtesy to the applicants to determine feasibility as well as to address any other issues of concern that may arise at the hearing. This review does not constitute an approval and nothing discussed in this session will be binding on the commissioners or applicants. The applicants acknowledged that this is a pre application discussion and nothing discussed would be binding on the applicants or the HPC.

1. 61 Franklin Street

Ms. Groben and Mr. Kuchta acknowledged that it is a pre application and nothing is binding on both the applicant and the HPC.

Mr. Doug Kuchta noted that the work on the existing home has been completed so are proposing to demolish the existing carport and proposing a new 1.5- story two car garage. It will be shingle style and in keeping with the existing house. The scale is in keeping with garages on Dean Street. They are proposing to modify the existing failing retaining wall on Dean Street to allow access for a single doorway on the garage itself. The second floor will remain unused. The proposal calls to reduce the coverage for the previously approved landscape design that include the pool and the terrace. The proposal will reduce the entire terrace, pergola and has a smaller footprint for the pool to accommodate the garage.

Mr. Tower expressed concern regarding four items specifically the height that is over 29-feet, the streetscape, transoms above the door and windows on the first floor do not relate to the neighborhood so does not comply with guideline B.1, and the flare of the roof seems pronounced as it relates to the main structure.

Ms. Laynor added that what is driving the transom is that the first floor is 12-feet high. She noted that the addition is 1,239 square feet and the garage is 1,071 square feet so it is large. She noted that key guidelines to consider include the overall unity of the setting and appropriateness of the setting on Dean Street, specifically whether it is in scale or compatible with the streetscape or whether it follows the scale of the neighboring building.

Chair Leahy summarized that the pre application for 61 Franklin Street is for a garage addition noting that the HPC provided feedback that the garage addition need more work in order to be in a feasible state. The areas of importance include more information in the application of how the building sits in the proposed streetscape along Dean Street and a section across Dean Street to show that the height and scale of the building does not have an adverse impact on this historic street. There were concerns regarding guideline B.1 that the building relate to the contributing historic buildings in the neighborhood. He explained that guideline B.2 and SOI #3 encourage that the building be compatible but not imitative some of the design features imitate and provide a false sense of history. The application needs consider guideline D.19 that relates to scale and compatibility of windows. He explained that the HPC did not have an issue with the demolition.

2. Hillman Garage Replacement Project

Ms. Fogarty shared the progress on the Hillman garage noting that there are two issues being addressed specifically the increasing amount of flooding and the dilapidated/outdated Hillman Garage. The CDAC recommended that the City tear down the garage and build a state of the art garage. She went over the outreach and community engagement feedback on the project thus far. She turned over the presentation to the team who will address some of the issues/questions raised relating to the stair tower, ramp and solar panels. There is a new City website on annapoliscity.project.com that residents can use for information on upcoming meetings.

Mr. Dueland went over the design evolution discussing the issues relating to the pedestrian traffic and further addressing the facade features to be in keeping with the historic district. The items flagged from the last meeting relate to the need to increase the number of parking spaces so the new design will have a full parking floor. They are also reviewing if it is possible to incorporate solar panels and a PV system to charge electric vehicles. He noted at the last meeting, the HPC asked that they show how the district height overlay relates to the elevation profile of the garage so slides were prepared to show this. He presented how the garage fits into the lot and parcel and the modifications to the ramp from Duke of Gloucester Street.

Mr. Turner discussed the new garage design from specific views and some of the improvements that include four (4) levels with brick at the corners, anchored corners with brick and metals around the windows. He noted that the grade is flatter off Duke of Gloucester Street for safety and the stair tower will be brick with metal frame windows. The solar panels will be placed in the middle to provide electricity to the grid and for electric charging vehicles as well as provide a canopy for the cars parked on that floor. He discussed the ground level pop up market, the north and south elevations.

Mr. Tower explained that the existing garage is open so does not present the bulk/mass as the proposal but does have linearity but not height. He has concern that the bulk in the corner brick structure may be greater than the adjacent pedigreed historic buildings. He believes that the proposed openings should not be as dominant as the other historic buildings. He believes that a great deal of thought has gone into this project.

Ms. Laynor noted the HPC need to understand that there is parking under the solar panels so there is a fifth floor. She referred to the corners as originally proposed in April seem compatible and flowed with the main section, but the top level now has an artificial appearance so is noticeable from Main Street as well as looking down from Conduit Street. She suggested revising the design so it appears lower and compatible as a whole. She asked about the width of the Gorman Street sidewalk and the plantings. Mr. Dueland noted that the width of Gorman is 20-feet in order to get stormwater treatment and planters in while maintaining a sidewalk. The two options were to set the building back towards Duke of Gloucester Street or look at sliming Gorman Street from 20-feet to 16-feet.

Chair Leahy summarized that the most important guideline is A.1 that relates to respecting traditional views from the State House grounds and Main Street in order to avoid creating an element that looms behind the set of buildings on Main Street so encouraged the Applicant team to be persuasive in showing that the proposal does not affect the views. In terms of massing and height, guideline B.1, the vocabulary of the windows specifically the bricks and the shape relates to the existing neighborhood so gives a nod to it but is not artificial in any way. Reducing the bulk on the highest side would be better for the project. The stair location will play into the discussion once that is established and the Applicant team needs to show the visual impact. Guideline D.5 relates to scale and massing of the building mass. The HPC believes that the Applicant team has been successfully addressed the height and there is no concept of a cornice on the front. The applicant has provided the specification on the bricks, the metal door materials are important and archaeology will be a condition when construction begins. There was discussion regarding design of the solar pergola feasibility and screening will be important from a feasibility standpoint. The lighting design will be an important feature for this project and more detail

should be included. There needs to be more detail on the ramps, landscape, benches, light fixtures, eventually signage in the final design. He concluded that much of the project is feasible but there is still more work needed.

J. OTHER BUSINESS

The HPC again thanked Ms. Laynor for her service to the City and HPC. Ms. Laynor noted that her last official day is July 9th and concluded that the City is a busy place making it hard to keep up. The face of the City will change dramatically over the next several years so encouraged the HPC to “hang tight to the preservation principles that guided you to this point and embrace the details that make up the City’s setting. She will certainly miss the HPC.

K. ADMINISTRATIVE BUSINESS

There was none.

J. ADJOURNMENT

With there being no further business, **Vice Chair** Collins moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:45pm. Mr. Williams seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously in a vote of 5-0.

The next meeting is June 24, 2021 as a virtual meeting.

Tami Hook, Recorder